	Case 2:22-cv-01916-DMC Document	14 Filed 09/01/23	Page 1 of 2	
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	KONONOV VITALY,	No. 2:22-CV-191	6-DMC-P	
12	Plaintiff,			
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>		
14	SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF DEPARTMENT, et al.,			
15	Defendants.			
16	2 CTCTICUMNOST			
17		_		
18	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to			
19	42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel,			
20	ECF No. 13.			
21	The United States Supreme Court has ruled that district courts lack authority to			
22	require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in § 1983 cases. See Mallard v. United States Dist.			
23	Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, the Court may request the			
24	voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). See Terrell v. Brewer, 935			
25	F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990).			
26	A finding of "exceptional circumstances" requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success			
27	on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims on his own in light of the			
28	complexity of the legal issues involved. See <u>Terrell</u> , 935 F.2d at 1017. Neither factor is			
		1		

1	dispositive and both must be viewed together before reaching a decision. See id. In Terrell, the			
2	Ninth Circuit concluded the district court did not abuse its discretion with respect to appointment			
3	of counsel because:			
4	Terrell demonstrated sufficient writing ability and legal knowledge to			
5	articulate his claim. The facts he alleged and the issues he raised were not of substantial complexity. The compelling evidence against Terrell made it extremely unlikely that he would succeed on the merits.			
6 7	<u>Id.</u> at 1017.			
8	In the present case, the Court does not at this time find the required exceptional			
9	circumstances. Plaintiff fails to set forth in his motion any bases for the appointment of counsel,			
10	and the Court finds none in this case.			
11	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's request for the			
12	appointment of counsel, ECF No. 13, is denied.			
13				
14	Dated: September 1, 2023			
15	DENNIS M. COTA			
16	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE			
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				